REMARKS

Claims 1-6 remain in this application. Claims 1-6 have been amended to clarify terms in light of the 35 U.S.C. §112(2) rejections previously asserted by the Examiner, and to further prosecution of this Application. No new matter has been introduced. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Applicant wishes to reiterate the arguments put forth in the Response of April 30, 2004. In addition, the Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed Amendments overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112(2).

Claims 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Mano et al.* (US Patent No. 5,793,366) Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed features of the broadcast manager of the present invention.

As described previously, the present invention relates to an information signal device connected to a network including an event manager for directing messages generated by objects to destinations within and outside the signal device, a network messenger for transmitting messages to a specified destination on the network, and an broadcast manager for broadcasting messages having unspecified destinations to the network. The broadcast manager also receives broadcast messages (sent by other signal devices connected to the network) from the network. In this manner, messages generated by objects in the information signal device are delivered to their respective destinations without any discrimination by the objects as to whether the destinations of the messages are outside or inside the information signal device by exchanging the messages with the event manager in a one-to-one communication.

The *Mano et al.* reference relates to a GUI interface simulating signal flow between devices on a network (col. 2, line 50 – col. 3, line 31). In *Mano*, task data sent between devices on a serial bus network is graphically represented via GUI to allow user to monitor the task data and to enter control commands respective to the task data.

In contrast, the present invention claims messages from the signal device being sent to a specified destination on the network are transmitted through the network messager, where messages that have unspecified destination are transmitted via a separate broadcast manager.

Mano is completely silent as to this feature, as Mano shows that messages from a particular

599189/D/1 4

device is communicated to another device which is a known or specified destination (col. 5, lines 7-16 – the device has to be specified before any communication may occur). For at least this reason, claim 1, and claims 2-6 which depend therefrom, are allowable over *Mano et al.*

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, as well as claims 2-6 which depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LOYD LLC

BY

Peter Zural/ Reg. No. 48,196

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4354

Dated: May 18, 2004

599189/D/1 5